



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/802,765	03/18/2004	Qun Sun	1861.1420003/JMC/RHD	4695
26111	7590	04/19/2005	EXAMINER	
STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX PLLC 1100 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			POWERS, FIONA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1626	

DATE MAILED: 04/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/802,765	SUN ET AL.	
	Examiner Fiona T. Powers	Art Unit 1626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-25,27-38 and 40 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1, 23 and 33 to 37 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 2-22,24, 25, 27-32,38 and 40 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/29/04.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date, \_\_\_\_.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_.

Receipt is acknowledged of the preliminary amendment filed March 18, 2004 and the information disclosure statement filed Jul 29, 2004, which have been entered in the file.

Claims 1 and 17 are objected to because of the following informalities: in claim 1, when R<sub>2</sub> is (vi) or (vii) the structures are the same. One of these structures should be deleted. In claim 17 "compounds" should be -compound-. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 20 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form.

Claim 20 is not a further limitation of claim 1 because the structure for R<sub>2</sub> in claim 20 does not appear in the definition of R<sub>2</sub> in claim 1.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 33 to 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a

Art Unit: 1626

method of treating or ameliorating a disorder responsive to blockage of sodium channels in a mammal suffering therefrom wherein the disorder is selected from the group consisting of neuronal damage, acute or chronic pain, depression, diabetic neuropathy and amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (ALS), does not reasonably provide enablement for a method of preventing the above mentioned disorders or a method of treating, preventing or ameliorating any disorder responsive to blockage of sodium channels or any neurodegenerative disease. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

The factors to be considered in determining whether a disclosure meets the enablement requirement of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph are as follows:

1. the nature of the invention,
2. the state of the prior art,
3. the predictability or lack thereof in the art,
4. the amount of direction or guidance present,
5. the presence or absence of working examples,
6. the breadth of the claims,
7. the quantity of experimentation needed, and
8. the level of skill in the art.

Art Unit: 1626

See *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400.

The nature of the invention is a method of treating, preventing or ameliorating any disorder responsive to blockage of sodium channels. The state of the prior art is that treating, preventing or ameliorating these disorders remains highly unpredictable. These various types of disorders have different causative agents, involve different cellular mechanisms, and consequently, differ in treatment protocol. There is no direction or guidance in the examples of the specification for the treating, preventing or ameliorating any disorder responsive to blockage of sodium channels. Thus due to the lack of guidance in the instant specification, one of ordinary skill in the art would need undue experimentation to use the claimed invention

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1, in the definition of  $R_2$  part (vii),  $R_9$  is defined but it does not appear in the formula.

In claim 1,  $R^1$  and  $R^2$  appear in the formula but  $R_1$  and  $R_2$  appear in the definitions. In the formula the superscripts should be changed to subscripts.

In claim 23,  $R_2$  is a monovalent radical but it is defined as "naphthalene" which is a complete compound. It is suggested that naphthalene be replaced by -naphthalenyl-.

The references made of record and not relied upon show the state of the art.

Claims 2 to 16, 18, 19, 21, 22, 24, 25, 27 to 32, 38 and 40 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Fiona T. Powers whose telephone number is 571-272-0702. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph K. McKane can be reached on 571-272-0699. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is  
571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

*Fiona T. Powers*  
Fiona T. Powers  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1626

ftp  
April 14, 2005